

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 3 and 5 through 10 are pending, with Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10 being independent. Claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1 through 3, 5, and 7 through 10 have been amended.

SECOND REQUEST FOR RETURN OF FORMS PTO-1449

Applicants respectfully note that the entry for the article cited in the January 22, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement Form PTO-1449 was not initialed, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner initial the same to confirm consideration.

Also, Applicants respectfully request return of the Form PTO-1449 from the January 11, 2005 Corrected Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicants would greatly appreciate receiving copies of the requested forms along with the next communication from the Office.

FURTHER REMARKS

The specification was objected to as failing to provide antecedent basis for the expression “computer-readable medium”. All objections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that *in haec verba* antecedent basis appears in the specification at page 5, line 13, and that such would be clear to the artisan in view of the discussion at page 38, lines 2 through 8.

Claims 1 through 10 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 over newly-cited US 2002/0044152 A1 (Abbott, III, et al.). (While paragraph 6 of the Official Action refers to Abbott, III, et al. by name but to the publication number associated with previously-cited Overton, et al., it is understood that the rejection is directed to the former document). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10 variously recite, *inter alia*, extracting a virtual image elimination area of the virtual image by (a) detecting an area of the real or video image corresponding to an area where the user designates in the real world and (b) extracting the detected area as the virtual image elimination area.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that Abbott, III, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10. Applicants respectfully submit that Abbott, III, et al. merely shows, e.g., detecting a whole *virtual object* as an elimination area, i.e., it can change a position, transparency or size of an image of a whole *virtual object* designated by a user (such as a compass 600 in Fig. 6). Applicants respectfully submit that such constitutes neither a description nor a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, and 10, including the recitation of an area corresponding to an area where the user designates *in the real world*. Applicants submit that the user of Abbott, III, et al.'s system cannot designate any area in the real world but instead designates a virtual object.

Applicants further respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in Abbott, III, et al. to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features. By means of such features, Applicants respectfully submit that, as shown in Figs. 1A and 1B, only a part of a virtual object can be designated and eliminated; this is because the present invention is extracting not a virtual object but an area from an image of the real world, so the user of the present invention's system designates an area in the real world regardless of whether or not the designated area includes a part of a virtual object.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that Abbott, III, et al. also fails to disclose or suggest the designation means of Claim 5, let alone using a frame

having a particular color, as recited in Claim 7, or at least one hand of the user as recited in Claim 8. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Attorney for Applicants
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/mcm

FCBS_WS 1597079v1